

## Remarks

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 16, and 22 have been amended. Claims 28-30 have been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, claims 1-27 remain pending in the application.

### Claim Rejections § 102

Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 13, 15, 16, 19-22, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,651,093 issued to Wiedeman (*Wiedeman*). For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 5-10, 13, 15, 16, 19-22, and 25-27 are not rendered anticipated by *Wiedeman*.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (“MPEP”), in § 2131, states:

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 869 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Thus, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a claim is anticipated *only if* each and every element of the claim is found in the cited reference and the cited reference must show the invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim.

Amended claim 1 recites:

A method of changing a network location of a network component comprising:

programmatically interrupting a link between the network component and a network, wherein the network component is associated with a network resource wrapper, the network resource wrapper to provide a machine accessible and standardized description of the network component;

changing the network to which the network component is linked; and

establishing a link between the network component and the changed network.

(Emphasis added). Independent claims 16 and 22 are, respectively, system and article claims that similarly recite, “wherein the network component is associated with a network resource wrapper, the network resource wrapper to provide a machine accessible and standardized description of the network component.”

*Wiedeman* is directed to the problem of dynamically connecting a system under test (SUT) to and disconnecting an SUT from a private virtual local area network in a computer manufacturing environment (see, e.g., the abstract). The solution proffered by *Wiedeman* is to use a VLAN cable switch to check the media access control (MAC) address of the SUT and to connect the SUT to one of a number of networks based on the MAC address of the SUT (see, e.g., the abstract).

In contrast to *Wiedeman*, independent claims 1, 16, and 22 recite that “the network component is associated with a network resource wrapper, the network resource wrapper to provide a machine accessible and standardized description of the network component.” For at least the reason that *Wiedeman* does not disclose “a network resource wrapper,” as recited in claims 1, 16, and 22, *Wiedeman* cannot anticipate claims 1, 16, and 22. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 16, and 22 be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5-10, 13, and 15 depend from claim 1. Claims 19-21 depend from claim 16. Claims 25-27 depend from claim 22. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 3, 5-10, 13, 15, 19-21, 25-27 and are not anticipated by *Wiedeman*.

Claim Rejections § 103

Claims 2, 11, 12, 17, 23, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiedeman* in view of Published U.S. Patent App. 2002/0065919A1 in the name of Taylor et al. (*Taylor*). Claims 28-30 have been cancelled without prejudice and, thus, the rejection of claims 28-30 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant submits that claims 2, 11, 12, 17, and 23 are patentable over *Wiedeman* in view of *Taylor*.

Claims 2, 11, and 12 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1. Claim 17 depends (directly or indirectly) from claim 16. Claim 23 depends (directly or indirectly) from claim 22.

*Taylor* is cited as teaching “a control server’s ability to reset power and reboot any device through the intelligent power supply.” Whether or not *Taylor* discloses the limitations cited by the Office action, it does not teach or suggest “a network resource wrapper, the network resource wrapper to provide a machine accessible and standardized description of the network component,” as recited in claims 1, 16, and 22. Because neither *Wiedeman* nor *Taylor* teaches or suggests the above-cited claim limitations, no combination of *Wiedeman* with *Taylor* teaches or suggests the invention as recited in

claim 1, 16, and 22. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2, 11, 12, 17, and 23 are patentable over *Wiedeman* in view of *Taylor*.

Claims 4, 14, 16, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiedeman* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,176 issued to Stewart et al. (*Stewart*). For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant submits that claims 4, 14, 16, and 24 are patentable over *Wiedeman* in view of *Stewart*.

Claims 4 and 14 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1. Claim 24 depends (directly or indirectly) from claim 22.

*Stewart* is cited as teaching “access points couple through VLAN.” Whether or not *Stewart* discloses the limitations cited by the Office action, it does not teach or suggest an “a network resource wrapper, the network resource wrapper to provide a machine accessible and standardized description of the network component,” as recited in claims 1, 16, and 22. Because neither *Wiedeman* nor *Stewart* teaches or suggests the above-cited claim limitations, no combination of *Wiedeman* with *Stewart* teaches or suggests the invention as recited in claim 1, 16, and 22. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 4, 14, 16, and 24 are patentable over *Wiedeman* in view of *Stewart*.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2007

/Philip A. Pedigo/  
Philip A. Pedigo  
Reg. No. 52,107  
Attorney for Intel Corporation

(503) 712-5560